

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 are pending in the application. Claim 4 has been canceled.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 has been objected to as being improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claim 4 has been canceled to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowno et al. (US Pub. 2002/0093578A1) in view of Okamura (USP 6,788,345) in further view of Miyawaki et al. (USP 6,522,360). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kowno states in paragraph [0109]:

if the pen input is executed, the shot image data and the line-drawing information input by the pen 41 are combined in the frame memory area of the buffer memory 36, and the combined image of the shot image and line-drawing is displayed on the LCD 6.

Further, Kowno states in paragraph [0161]:

For example, as shown in FIG. 8, the tip of the pen 41 presses on a dragging starting point “a” of the touch tablet 6A disposed over the LCD 6 when a specified image is displayed on the LCD 6. The pen tip is dragged while pressing against touch tablet 6A to a dragging ending point “b”.

In view of the foregoing statements, Kowno displays the line-drawing (including the dragging starting point "a") as soon as the pen tip makes contact with the LCD 6; i.e., immediately after initiation of a designating operation of the electronic zoom area by a user.

In contrast, in the claimed invention of the present application, "a mark indicative of a center point of an electronic zoom area" is displayed "prior to initiation of a designating operation of the electronic zoom area by a user," as recited in claim 1. More specifically, as stated in page 10, lines 3-9 of the specification and as shown in Fig. 4 of the present application:

When the power supply of the digital still camera is turned on to establish the picture-taking mode, the image of the subject is sensed by the CCD 2. When this takes place, the full image is displayed on the display screen of the display unit 6, as set forth above (step 21). The user checks the position of the arrow C1 being displayed on the full image.

Although the user checks the position of the arrow C1, the user has not yet initiated a designation operation of the electronic zoom area. The designation operation of the electronic zoom area is initiated by the user when it is determined, in step 22 shown in Fig. 4, that the electronic zoom center is not OK and needs to be changed by operating a zoom-area designating switch disclosed in page 6, line 25-26 of the specification, or arguably when the user operates the zoom changeover switch included among the operating switches 10 (see step 23 and page 10, lines 11-13 of the specification).

Therefore, Kowno fails to disclose or suggest the "display control unit," as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kowno does not disclose a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light-emission device in such a manner that the strobe light-emission

device illuminates precisely a position of a subject that corresponds to the center point of the designated electronic zoom area.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Okamura reference to show that controlling of an illuminating angle of a flash device according to magnification varying information is known in the art.

The Examiner also acknowledges that Kowno in view of Okamura fails to disclose or suggest recording on the recording media image data output from the image sensing device and data indicating position of the electronic zoom area or image data representing the image with the electronic zoom area.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Miyawaki reference to show that an image sensing apparatus for sensing an image of a subject and a designating unit for designating an electronic zoom area in the image of the subject is known in the art.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that even assuming that Kowno, Okamura, and Miyawaki can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Kowno in view of Okamura and in further view of Miyawaki fails to disclose or suggest “displaying, on the image of the subject, a mark indicative of a center point of an electronic zoom area prior to initiation of a designating operation of the electronic zoom area by a user, the center point of the electronic zoom area being different from a center point of the image of the subject,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 5-7, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 2 and 8 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Claim 4 has been canceled.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kowno in view of Okamura (USP 6,788,345). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

More specifically, even assuming that Kowno and Okamura can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Kowno in view of Okamura fails to disclose or suggest “displaying, on the image of the subject, a mark indicative of a center point of an electronic zoom area prior to initiation of a designating operation of the electronic zoom area by a user, the center point of the electronic zoom area being different from a center point of the image of the subject,” as recited in claim 9.

Claim 10, dependent on claim 9, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 9.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 09/766,577
Reply dated June 4, 2007
to Office Action of March 9, 2007
Page 11 of 11

Docket No.: 0905-0254P

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


fr By D. Richard Anderson (Reg.# 40,417)
D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant